

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 are pending. Claims 2, 4, and 11 are amended. Claims 1, 3, 10, and 14 were canceled in a previous amendment.

Support for the amendments to Claims 2, 4, and 11 can be found at page 10, line 14 – page 11, line 6, for example. No new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 2, 4-9, and 11-13 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as anticipated by Tonkin (U.S. Patent No. 6,134,568, herein “Tonkin”).

Regarding the rejection of independent Claim 2 as anticipated by Tonkin, that rejection is respectfully traversed by the present response.

Amended independent Claim 2 recites, in part:

wherein said document supervisory server changes a combination of the print condition settings and sends an appropriate combination including one set of changed print condition settings to the document supervisory client when determining the print condition settings are incompatible with each other.

Accordingly, when the settings are **incompatible** with each other, the supervisory server changes a combination of the print condition settings and sends the appropriate combination to the client.

In contrast, Tonkin changes no settings when incompatible settings are entered by a user. Rather, when faced with incompatible settings, the device of Tonkin sends an error message to the user.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Tonkin, col. 10, lines 23-43.

To the extent that Tonkin changes settings, Tonkin does so when settings are left unspecified by the user. Tonkin states:

If the user has specified a particular component, the document component object corresponding to that component will include a pointer to a production component object for that particular component. This is generally the case for printed pages and tab pages. **On the other hand, if the user has merely specified a type of a component to be used, the corresponding document component object preferably will merely include a reference to a class or a sub-class of production components. This will generally be the case for document bindings. In this regard, it is generally preferable to allow the user to specify a type of binding and allow the software to select a specific binding of that type based on properties, such as thickness, of the final document.** Such a selection process is described below.<sup>2</sup>

Thus, the user specifies a particular component or a type of component to be used. The software then selects a specific component such as a specific binding that will work with the component specified by the user to create a complete group of settings by which the document is produced. In other words, Tonkin allows a user to select a general high level setting while leaving selection of unspecified details up to the software. Tonkin states:

Returning to FIG. 4, upon receiving an indication that the document specification is ready, processing proceeds from step 254 to step 255. In step 255, the document component objects are combined with the production component objects. Combining these objects results in: (1) determination of values for the remaining document attributes 483 to 486 and (2) selection of specific production components for those cases where the user has merely specified a component type.<sup>3</sup>

Thus, Tonkin does not supply appropriate settings when settings are incompatible with each other. Rather, Tonkin allows a user to select one general setting and then supplies the remaining settings in response to the selected general setting.

---

<sup>2</sup> Tonkin, col. 9, lines 24-37 (emphasis added).

<sup>3</sup> Tonkin, col. 9, lines 43-51.

As discussed in the previous response, if the settings supplied by the user conflict, Tonkin merely sends an error message to the user.<sup>4</sup>

As explained above, Tonkin does not disclose a document supervisory server that changes a combination of print condition settings and sends an appropriate combination of settings to the document supervisory client when determining the print condition settings are incompatible with each other as recited in amended independent Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claim 2 be withdrawn.

Amended independent Claims 4 and 11 recite substantially similar features to those discussed above regarding amended independent Claim 2. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent Claims 4 and 11 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as amended independent Claim 2.

Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 depend from amended independent Claim 4. Claims 12 and 13 depend from amended independent Claim 11. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 12, and 13 patentably distinguish over Tonkin for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Gregory J. Maier  
Registration No. 25,599  
Surinder Sachar  
Registration No. 34,423

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James D. Hamilton  
Registration No. 28,421

Customer Number

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413 -2220

(OSMMN 03/06)

<sup>4</sup> Tonkin, col. 10, lines 23-43.